

[Handwritten signature]



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,311	03/26/2001	Barry Lynn Royer	2001P04780US	8865

7590 07/01/2005

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

CALLAHAN, PAUL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,311

Applicant(s)

ROYER

Examiner

Paul Callahan

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,5-8,11-13 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4,9 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ PC
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-17 were pending in this application at the time of the previous Office Action. New claims 18 and 19 have been added by the latest amendment. Claims 1-19 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 4-8-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Bladlow fails to teach supporting concurrent operations of a plurality of network compatible applications, yet such is taught at col. 3 lines 1-21 where a number of concurrent services are managed simultaneously.

The applicant argues that Bladlow fails to teach generation of a session identifier, yet such is taught at col. 3 line 35-45, where a session identifier is generated and sent to a server, either by the user logon data entry or by an application in the alternative.

The applicant traverses the taking of Official Notice in claims 8 and 13 and asks for a showing of art. As a showing of art, the applicant's attention is drawn to, for example, Schneier, Applied Cryptography 2nd Edition, Oct. 1995, pages 50-51 where generation of a random key for use in key establishment protocols is taught.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11-13, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow et al., US 6,115,040, and Schneier: Applied Cryptography 2nd Edition, Oct. 1995

As for claim 1, Bladow teaches a system employed by a first application for supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of network compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), comprising: an entitlement processor for authorizing user access to said first application in response to validation of user identification information (col. 3 lines 30-46)., and a communication processor for initiating generation of a session identifier particular to a user initiated session and for use by a plurality of concurrently operating applications to uniquely identify said user initiated session in response to validation of user identification information (col. 3 lines 30-46). Bladow does not explicitly teach generation of an encryption key for encrypting personal record parameters conveyed in URL data. However Schneier does teach this feature in page 50-51. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Bladow. Motive to make this combination is

found for example at page 50 4th paragraph where resistance to a man in the middle attack is an advantage of this approach. Such a benefit in an Internet URL request would be advantageous.

As for claim 5, Bladow teaches a system according to claim 1, including an input processor for receiving said session identifier and an associated encryption key from said managing application (col. 7 lines 30-45).

As for claim 6, Bladow teaches a system according to claim 5, including an encryption processor for use in encrypting data associated with a personal record (col. 7 lines 30-45).

As for claim 7, Bladow teaches a system employed by a managing application for supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of network compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), comprising'. an input processor for receiving from a first application a session initiation request to initiate generation of a session identifier (col. 4 lines 1-12)', a session identifier generator for generating a session identifier particular to a user initiated session and for use by a plurality of concurrently operating applications to uniquely identify said user initiated session (col.3 lines 30-46)., and a communication processor for, communicating said session identifier to said first application and communicating said session identifier to another application of said plurality of concurrently operating applications in response to a request to receive said generated

session identifier (col.3 lines 30-67, col. 4 lines 1-12). Bladlow does not explicitly teach generation of an encryption key for encrypting personal record parameters conveyed in URL data. However Schneier does teach this feature in page 50-51. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Bladlow. Motive to make this combination is found for example at page 50 4th paragraph where resistance to a man in the middle attack is an advantage of this approach. Such a benefit in an Internet URL request would be advantageous.

As for claim 11, Bladlow teaches a system supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of Internet compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), comprising: a browser application providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification information and commands for a plurality of Internet compatible applications and for providing user identification information to a first application for validation (abstract, fig. 2 item 20: "Browser", fig. 4),' and a managing application for generating a session identifier particular to a user initiated session in response to receiving a session initiation request from a first application and for communicating said session identifier to said first application (col. 3 lines 1-21 , 30-46).). Bladlow does not explicitly teach generation of an encryption key for encrypting personal record parameters conveyed in URL data. However Schneier does teach this feature in page 50-51. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Bladlow. Motive to make this combination is

found for example at page 50 4th paragraph where resistance to a man in the middle attack is an advantage of this approach. Such a benefit in an Internet URL request would be advantageous.

As for claim 12, Bladow teaches a system according to claim 11, wherein said managing application also communicates to said first application data items including one or more of, (a) a key to be used in encrypting and decrypting a session identifier conveyed in URL data, (b) an indicator identifying whether or not a session initiation request is successful.

As for claim 16, Bladow teaches a method employed by a first application operating in a system supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of Internet compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), said method comprising the steps of: authorizing user access to said first application in response to validation of user identification information', and communicating a session initiation request to a managing application to initiate generation of a session identifier particular to a user initiated session in response to validation of user identification information (col. 3 lines 30-46). Bladow does not explicitly teach generation of an encryption key for encrypting personal record parameters conveyed in URL data. However Schneier does teach this feature in page 50-51. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Bladow. Motive to make this combination is found for example at page 50 4th paragraph where

resistance to a man in the middle attack is an advantage of this approach. Such a benefit in an Internet URL request would be advantageous.

As for claim 17, Bladow teaches a method employed by a managing application for supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of network compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), comprising the steps of: receiving from a first application a session initiation request to initiate generation of a session identifier (col. 18 lines 12-65)*, generating a session identifier particular to a user initiated session and for use by a plurality of concurrently operating applications to uniquely identify said user initiated session (col. 3 lines 30-46)., and communicating said session identifier to said first application and to another application of said plurality of concurrently operating applications in response to a request to receive said generated session identifier (col. 18 lines 13-65).). Bladow does not explicitly teach generation of an encryption key for encrypting personal record parameters conveyed in URL data. However Schneier does teach this feature in page 50-51. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Bladow. Motive to make this combination is found for example at page 50 4th paragraph where resistance to a man in the middle attack is an advantage of this approach. Such a benefit in an Internet URL request would be advantageous.

Claims 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow and Official Notice. Bladow teaches all of the limitations of claims 7 and 11 upon

Art Unit: 2137

which claims 8 and 13 depend, but does not teach the feature of an encryption key generator for substantially randomly generating an encryption key particular to said user initiated session, in response to said session initiation request. However Official Notice may be taken that the use of a randomly generated key in session establishment protocols is a step that is old and well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Bladow. The motive to make this combination is discussed by Bladow in col. 7 lines 30-45 where the advantage of establishment of a secure session is discussed. Use of a randomly generated key would facilitate this secure session.

As for claims 18 and 19, a tangible storage medium is inherent to the system of Bladow.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 10 and 15 are allowed.
6. Claims 2-4, 9, and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (703) 305-1336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (703) 306-3035. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

6/25/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul Callahan", written in a cursive style.